

Application No. 10/026,486  
Amendment "1" dated March 9, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed November 9, 2005

### REMARKS

These remarks are responsive to the Office Action dated November 9, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action"). Claims 1-8 are pending, of which Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are independent claims and Claims 2, 4, 6 and 8 are respective dependent claims. The Office Action rejects each of the independent claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States patent number 5,566,225 issued to Haas (the patent hereinafter referred to as "Haas"). The Office Action further rejects each of the dependent claims as being unpatentable over Haas in view of United States patent number 6,430,624 issued to Jamtgaard, et al. (the patent hereinafter referred to as "Jamtgaard"). The Applicants respectfully traverse both of these rejections and request reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

In Haas, a "Network-Based Agent" is described as communicating between end-user device 101 and host 160. If the "Network-Based Agent" determines that communication has been disrupted, the "Network-Based Agent" emulates the operating mode behavior of mobile end user device 101 on behalf of mobile end-user device 101 to maintain connection to host 160. Specifically, the "Network-Based Agent" responds to the keep-alive message and disrupts data transmission. Subsequently, when the communication is restored (i.e., when end-user device 101 and host 160 is reconnected), the "Network-Based Agent" transfers the received information while the communication was disconnected (see Haas, column 6, lines 22-59). However, the "Network-Based Agent" transfers the information while the communication was disconnected and does not continue to execute the service. This is clear from the definition that no application process (AP) functionality needs to be performed by the Agents (see Haas, column 2, lines 64 and 65).

In contrast, the agent recited in each of independent Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 reproduces the session between the server and the proxy service control apparatus to continue to execute the service on behalf of the application stored in the end-user device. Consequently, the agent transfers the service executed by the agent to the application stored in the end-user device when the communication is restored.

For example, a plurality of get-message may be transmitted from the application to the server when displaying a Web page. The application receives response for the respective get-message and displays a Web page. When the communication is disconnected before receiving all

Application No. 16/026,196  
Amendment "D" dated March 9, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed November 9, 2005

the responses, the agent would transfer all the get-messages to the server, receive all the responses from the server, and transfer a complete Web page to the application. In contrast, the "Network-Based Agent" of Haas transfers get-messages and responses from which the communication was disconnected. In order to display a Web page, the disconnected session must be reconstructed in the application.

Therefore, there is a significant recited feature of each of the independent claims that is lacking in the description of Haas in that the service agent connected between the user's terminal and the server executes the service on behalf of the application of the user's terminal. Thus, Haas does not anticipate any of the independent claims, and the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of the independent claims should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Jamtgaard also does not teach this feature. Therefore, even if Haas and Jamtgaard are combined (the appropriateness of which still not being conceded), the combination would not teach or suggest all of the features of any of the independent claims. The respectively dependent claims are patentable over the combination for at least this reason. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of the dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 9<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE  
Registration No. 42,785  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 022913

ALL:ads  
DS0600005205V001